

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In the Application of:

Kimming So, et al.

Serial No.: 10/750,523

Filed: December 31, 2003

For: A MINI-TRANSLATION LOOKASIDE
BUFFER FOR USE IN MEMORY
TRANSLATION

Examiner: Yaima Campos

Group Art Unit: 2185

Conf. No.: 1971

Electronically Filed on August 15, 2007

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This paper is filed as a timely response to the Office Action mailed May 16, 2007.

Applicants respectfully request consideration of the following remarks.

In a conversation on January 18, 2007, the Examiner had indicated that Claim 1 was rejected because patentable subject matter had been recited in the preamble of Claim 1. The patentable subject matter comprises the phrase "reducing the size" found in the preamble of Claim 1. Furthermore, as was stated in the Examiner's first Point of Argument in the Advisory Action of January 23, 2007, "the recitation "A method of *reducing the size* of a translation lookaside buffer comprising" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs

Application No. 10/750,523

In Response to Office Action Mailed on May 16, 2007

Response Dated: August 15, 2007

in the preamble.” In response to the conversation and Advisory Action, the Applicants had incorporated the alleged patentable subject matter (i.e., “reducing the size”) found in the preamble of Claim 1, as indicated by the Examiner, into the body of three new independent Claims 29, 32, and 35, in a Preliminary Amendment and Request for Continued Examination (RCE) on February 22, 2007. As a consequence, the Applicants expected an allowance of Claims 29, 32, and 35 since the Examiner’s indicated patentable subject matter was incorporated into the body of these new claims. However, the Examiner has not allowed these claims to the surprise of the Applicants. It appears that the Examiner has disregarded what she had stated during the conversation and in the first Point of Argument in the Advisory Action with respect to incorporating the indicated patentable subject matter into the body of the claims. The Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 29, 32, and 35 are in condition for allowance; consequently, the Applicants expect the allowance of Claims 29, 32, and 35 and their associated dependent claims. Otherwise, the Applicants request the Examiner to provide an explanation as to why the patentable subject matter incorporated into Claims 29, 32, and 35 has not been considered or disregarded in each of Claims 29, 32, and 35.